

1  
2  
3  
4                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
5                   **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
6

7                   **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**  
8                   Plaintiff,  
9                   vs.  
10                  **RONALD WILLIAM BANNISTER,**  
11                  Defendant.

3:04-cr-00097-RCJ-VPC

12                   **ORDER**  
13  
14                  On July 28, 2004, a grand jury indicted Ronald William Bannister on two counts: (1)  
15                  bank robbery, and (2) attempted bank robbery. (Indictment, ECF No. 1.) On April 5, 2005,  
16                  Bannister pleaded guilty to Count One. (Change of Plea, ECF No. 32.) On July 22, 2005,  
17                  Bannister was sentenced to a prison term of 33 months with three years of supervised release to  
18                  follow, and Count Two of the indictment was dismissed on the Government's motion.  
19                  (Sentencing, ECF No. 35; Judgment, ECF No. 36.)  
20  
21                  Now, Bannister has filed five motions in this case which appear to have nothing to do  
22                  with his indictment in July 2004. (ECF Nos. 41, 44, 45, 47, 48.) Rather, all of the motions relate  
23                  to a demand for speedy trial or dismissal based on the Interstate Agreement on Detainers  
24                  ("IAD"). The motions challenge a detainer placed on Bannister in 2009 while he was  
incarcerated at Mule Creek State Prison in Lone, California. (*Id.* at 3.) The detainer related to  
federal criminal charges against Bannister in the Central District of California. (*Id.* at 3–4.)

The above-entitled criminal case was closed over ten years ago following Bannister's guilty plea and sentencing. The action Bannister now attempts to bring by way of his motions has no connection to this case, and thus the Court cannot entertain the motions as presently filed. If Bannister wishes to challenge his indictment in the Central District of California based on violations of the IAD, he should file a motion in his criminal case in that District. *See United States v. Lualemaga*, 280 F.3d 1260, 1262 (9th Cir. 2002). If he wishes to redress some other civil wrong, he should file a new civil action in a court of appropriate jurisdiction.

However, the Court notes, without ruling on the issue, that there is no apparent link between the facts giving rise to Bannister's IAD complaint and the District of Nevada. The detainer was placed on Bannister while in a California state prison and related to criminal charges in the Central District of California. Bannister is currently still in California, at the Substance Abuse Treatment Facility and State Prison in Corcoran. (ECF No. 48.) These circumstances make it very unlikely that this Court would have jurisdiction over any aspect of this matter.

## CONCLUSION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motions (ECF Nos. 41, 44, 45, 47, 48) are DENIED as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no further documents shall be filed in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: This 13<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2017.

ROBERT C. JONES  
United States District Judge